

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the:
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

Cullen & Co
GPO Box 1074
BRISBANE QLD 4001

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

		Date of mailing (day/month/year)	12 NOV 2004
Applicant's or agent's file reference 030943PC		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/AU2004/001107	International filing date (day/month/year) 19 August 2004	Priority date (day/month/year) 19 August 2003	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC Int. Cl. 7 B62D 24/04 B60G 13/10			
Applicant TRAMANCO PTY LTD et al			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AU AUSTRALIAN PATENT OFFICE PO BOX 200, WODEN ACT 2606, AUSTRALIA E-mail address: pct@ipaaustralia.gov.au Facsimile No. (02) 6285 3929	Authorized Officer ROSS BURDON Telephone No. (02) 6283
---	--

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/001107

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material

- a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material

- in written format
 in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing

- contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/AU2004/001107

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
------------------	---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 2 to 23	YES
	Claims 1	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 5, 6, 8 to 23	YES
	Claims 1 to 4, 7	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1 to 23	YES
	Claims -none-	NO

Citations and explanations:

Citations:

D1: ZA 9 301 540
D2: DE 42 26 101

NOVELTY (N) Claim 1

One of the combinations of features which make up claim 1 is disclosed in citation D1. I note that claim 1 does not include any method step of logging so I read it that the method is necessarily suitable for logging.

The device of D1 dynamically measures the a vehicle load using an hydraulic-electronic weighing system mounted on the vehicle as part of the suspension system. The load that is measured and displayed in the vehicle's cab is the instantaneous, or impact, loading of the vehicle. Using the device of D1 is then a performance of the method of claim 1. Therefore claim 1 lacks novelty.

INVENTIVE STEP (IS) Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7

Claim 1: as above.

Claims 2 and 4: D1 further discloses an electronic controller and a display in the vehicle's cab. While not explicitly disclosing the signal amplifier of claim 2, the treatment given to the signals must be that which is sufficient to allow display of the result. Such signal treatments whether by signal amplifier or by electronic controller, are usual treatments provided by the person skilled in the art and confer no invention. Therefore, in light of D1 and the common general knowledge of the person skilled in the art, claims 2 and 4 are not inventive.

Claims 3 and 7: The teachings of D2 include the electronic processing, calibration, storage and evaluation of measurements from a multiplicity of load measuring devices that may be associated with the suspension parts of a vehicle. Since it would be obvious for a person skilled in the art to combine the disclosures of D1 and D2, the inventions defined by these claims lack an inventive step.